# INDEX of WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
OGISU, Riprei (resumed)	23042
Cross by Colonel Smirnov (cont'd)	23042
MORNING RECESS	23061
Cross by Colonel Smirnov (cont'd)	23067
NOON RECESS	23075
Redirect by Mr. Blakeney	23077
("itness excused)	23083
OTA, Saburo	23087
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	23087
Cross by Colonel Smirnov	23105
AFTERNOON RECESS	23106
Cross by Colonel Smirnov (cont'd)	23107
Redirect by Mr. Blakeney	23114
Recross by Colonel Smirnov	23118

## INDEX

Of

## EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. Pros. No. No.	Description For Ident.	In Evidence
None	2657	Map made by the USSR and published in 1935 23060	23073
None	2657-A	Copy of the above Map with markings by Witness OGISU, Rippei	23073
240	2658	Address by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hashiro ARITA, delivered at the 79th Session of the Diet 1 February 1940	23085
1581	2659	Affidavit of OTA, Saburo	23092
1481	2660	Map attached to the TOGO- Molotov Agreement (prosecution exhibit No. 767) 23117	

#### Tuesday, 27 May 1947 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL 4 FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal 5 War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 6 7 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 8 at 0930. 9 10 Appearances: 11 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 12 exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member 13 from the Republic of China, now sitting. 14 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 15 For the 'efense Section, same as before. 16 17 (English to Japanese and Japanese 18 to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, INTFE.) 20 21 22 23 24 25

whalen & Selzer

1

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

MARSHALL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: I refer to page 23,017 of the record at lines 12 to 18 inclusive were not in evidence. That part of the exhibit was not read and should not appear in the transcript.

All of the accused are present except the accused TOJO, who, with the Court's permission, is interviewing his counsel outside the court room.

Colonel Smirnov.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Thank you, your Honor.

13

14

15

16

17

RIPPEI OGISU, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters, as follows:

18

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

19

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV: (Continued)

20

Q From what post were you transferred to the post of the commander of the 6th Army?

23

24

22

A I was transferred from my former position as chief of the 13th Division in Central China to be commender of the 6th Army in Manchurja.

25

Q If we shall believe the list of your career

you were commender of the 13th Division from 1937 to 1939, is that correct?

A Yes, that is so.

O Before that you were chiefly engaged in pedagogical work weren't you; or in pedagogical activities, weren't you?

A Yes.

Q You personelly participated in military operations in Shanghai, Nanking, Hsuchow and Hankow, did you not?

IR. ELAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, I object to this line of questioning as being without the scope of the direct testimony about operations in which he perticipated.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

COLONEL SPIRFOV: Your Honor, by this line of questioning I tried to establish whether the witness is competent to give the evidence which he is giving.

As far as I know my learned colleague, who has just made the objection, often used this way of oucstioning in preceding phases.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKEMEY: The witness testified only to the facts that occurred while commander of the 6th Army, and what he was told by others there.

1 2

3

4

,

6

1

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: The question is directed to these particular operations and it is not very easy to draw the line. To disallow the question would, I think, be to draw too nerrow ---- too strict --4 to take too strict a view. The witness will answer the auestion. THE INTERPRETER: The witness answered "yes" 7 your Honor. 8 O However, prior to your arrival there on August 13, 1939, you were not connected in any way with the Manchurian theater of operations, partic-11 ulerly with the sector where the 6th Arry was located, is that correct?

A That is so.

O Prior to that time you made no special investigations as to where was the boundary line in that rrea, is that correct?

A Until I was appointed to that post I never made any such research.

THE CONITOR: Investigation rather than research.

- Do you know the time of the beginning of the fighting operations in the Khalkin-Gol area?
- f I think -- I believe the incident began ground the middle of lay.

1 2

3

5

6

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

25

24

THE PRESIDENT: The guestion is directed to 1 these particular operations and it is not very easy 2 to draw the line. To disallow the question would, 3 I think, be to draw too narrow ---- too strict --4 to take too strict a view. The mitness will answer 5 the auestion. THE INTERPRETER: The witness enswered "yes" 7 your Honor. 8 O However, prior to your arrival there on 9 Jugust 13, 1939, you were not connected in any way 10

O However, prior to your errival there on /usust 13, 1939, you were not connected in any way with the Manchurian theater of operations, particularly with the sector where the 6th /rry was located, is that correct?

A That is so.

O Prior to that time you made no special investigations as to where was the boundary line in that erea, is that correct?

A Until I was appointed to that post I never made any such research.

THE FORITOR: Investigation rather than research.

O Do you know the time of the beginning of the fighting operations in the Khalkin-Gol area?

f I think -- I believe the incident began eround the middle of May.

14

11

12

13

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

25

O At that time you were in China as commander of the 12th Division, weren't you?

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: The 13th Division.

A. That is so.

O What gives you the right to contend so categorically in your affidavit that the boundary line ran on the River Halha and was violated allegedly by the Soviet troops?

A I was able to ascertain this after I went to that area by investigations which I made on the spot, by inspection tours which I made, by reports made by my subordinates and from remorts -- and from my direction of the fighting --- thereafter.

Q You arrived at the Khalkin-Gol area on August 13, 1939, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q For how many days had you been in this area prior to your departure for Hailar?

A On the 13th as soon as I assumed command of my army I arrived in the Halha river area and then went back the same day. On the 23rd I went there again in order to direct the fighting. Correction: in order to investigate the fighting.

O Thus from the 14th of August to the 24th of August, you were absent from the area of the battle,

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

18

17

19

21

22

23 24

veren'	U	your

A That is so.

Q And during this time you were engaged in inspecting troops stationed near Hailer -- in other words, in the area 100 kilometers distant from the Nomonhan area?

THE MONITOR: The two questions before this, direct or take command should be corrected again to direct the fighting. It was corrected to investigate, but that should be corrected again to take command.

O You arrived to the area of fighting again on the 24th, that is at the time of the most hard fighting in the whole history of the Noronhan operations?

A There was almost no fighting from the 13th to the 19th.

O My question was evidently mistranslated.

I asked you whether you arrived again at the area of the fighting on the 24th of August at the time when there was most hard fighting in that area?

A It was on the 19th -- it was on the 19th that the Mongolian and Soviet forces crossed the border in force and attacked us. I heard of this situation on the night of the 20th and ---

O I ask you quite another question. I ask you

4

2

3

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

14

15

15

18

19

21

22

24

whether you arrived at the Khalkin-Gol area on the 24th during the climax of the fighting operations, was that correct?

A On the evening of the 23rd I went to the field of battle.

THE MONITOR: Your Honor, the statement made by the witness contained no subject so we are inquiring into that, sir.

A The prosecutor used the word returned to the bettle field, but I meent to say that I went to the battle field for the first time. Excuse me, correction, I advanced to the battle field.

14

13

23

24

15. 

whether you arrived at the Khalkin-Gol area on the 24th during the climax of the fighting operations, was that correct?

A On the evening of the 23rd I went to the field of battle.

THE MONITOR: Your Honor, the statement made by the witness contained no subject so we are inquiring into that, sir.

A The prosecutor used the word returned to the bettle field, but I meent to say that I went to the bettle field for the first time. Excuse me, correction, I advanced to the bettle field.

3

4

5

6

1

0

...

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q At any rate when you returned to the battle area on the 23d of August that was the time of the climax of the fighting; is that correct?

CROSS

A That is so. However, it was not a period of time.

However, I was not returning -- correction.

Q I understand what you speak about. At any rate from August 23d to the 30th of August in the Nomongan area it was the most hardest fighting of the whole history of the Nomongan incident; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q You were there at that time so you could have conducted investigations as to where the boundary line passed, let us say, on May 15, 1939. You had arrived at that time to direct battle operations, hadn't you?

A Yes. I saw the territory in dispute with my own eyes on the field of battle -- in the field of operations.

Q Thus the information given to you by Major General KAMATSUBARA, former commander of the 23d Division is your only source of information as to the boundary line as it was passing on the 15th of May 1939, is that so?

A I went to the field of battle and I directed

25

the operations of my subordinates because I knew where 1 the boundary line was. Q From what sources did you know that? From the 3 information given you by Major General KAMATSUBARA? A Yes, Lieutenant General KAMATSUBARA reported 5 to me on the field of battle. THE MONITOR: I received a report from him. 7 Q That was approximately on August 14th or 8 August 15th 1939, was it not? 9 A No. On the 14th and 15th of August I was in 10 Hailar and did not see Lieutenant General KAMATSUBARA. 11 Q When was it then? 12 A On the 13th when I arrived on the field of 13 battle we met each other for the first time there. And 14 after the 23d up to the end of the fighting we were 15 16 continuously together in the field of operations. 17 Q At any rate your source of information as 18 to where the border line was passing was for you the 19 information given by General KAMATSUBARA; isn't it so? 20 A Lieutenant General KAMATSUBARA was not my only 21 source of information. From all the information that 22 I was able to gather I saw, heard and judged for myself, 23

and then based my operations on that judgment.

THE MONITOR: With conviction.

Q What personal impressions could you derive from

the battle area? What was the stage of the fighting, size of fighting parties when you arrived to the area? I ask you to give characterization of the fighting situation at that time?

A This is the situation of August 13th: Strong artillery of the Outer Mongolian and Soviet forces based on the west side -- based on the hills on the west side of the Halha River were bombarding our forces.

Q Were the infantry units on the eastern side of the Halha River at that time?

A The 23d Division and units under its command were in scattered positions on the east side of the Halha River.

Q Will you state were the Soviet and Mongolian troops both on the eastern bank of the Halha River?

A A very small proportion of the Soviet and Outer Mongolian forces had crossed the river and were on the east side.

Q At any rate, even at that time when you arrived to the area of the fighting the small -- or the large part of the Soviet and Mongolian troops were on the eastern bank of the Halha River; was it not so?

A Yes.

Q And later the whole area of the battle was on the east bank of the Halha River? I speak about the

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

las	t ten days of August, from the 20th to the 30th.
	A Yes.
	Q Do you remember the geographical names of this
are	a of the points of this area of the main points
of	this area?
	A I remember a few. Would you please ask me
spe	cifically?
	Q The area of the fighting was then divided into
two	parts, the northern part and the southern part,
and	it was divided by the River Hailastyn which flows
int	o the Khalkin Gol River?
	A That is so.
	Q The most remote point, starting from the Halha
hiv	er, was the point named Nomonghan-Burd-Obo which is
app	roximately twenty kilometers from the place where
the	Hailastyn River flows into the Halha River? I
spe	ak about the depth of the front.
	A It was on the northeastern it was to the
nor	theast?

Q That is quite correct, it was to the northeast

and it was approximately twenty kilometers deep?

A It was approximately as you say.

23

20

21

22

24

25.

Duda & Lefler

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Q And along the front, the area of the fighting was approximately sixty or seventy kilometers wide, the area of the fighting on the eastern bank of the Halha River.

A Our forces were scattered at different points and were defending their positions.

Q I understand you. But, in this case, I wanted to speak in military terms with you.

THE PRESIDENT: This cross-examination,

Colonel, is not very helpful when our main duty
here is to determine boundaries. I suggest that you
use maps more freely. On the map before me, I have
failed to see yet a single name that you have mentioned. I may have the wrong map, but I do not
think so. Hailar is the only name on this map that
we recognize.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, as to maps, I am rather in a difficult position.

THE PRESIDENT: I am looking at exhibit No. 2650-C which I assume covers the area. Perhaps I wrongly assume so.

CCLONEL SITEMOV: No, your Honor. The map which may cover the area of the fighting is the map attached to exhibit No. 767, but the point is, your Honor, that photo copies of this map were made with-

out using filters and that is why the river itself 1 is hardly distinct on this map. We tried to make for the Court new copies of the map, but we were 3 not given the exhibit to make photo copies of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, with all respect, I suggest that we are wasting time in listening to this witness being cross-examined without the assistance of maps which show the places to which he refers and to which you refer, Colonel.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, then may the witness be shown the original copy of exhibit 767?

THE PRESIDENT: I understand from my colleagues who have made a careful study of the map attached to exhibit No. 767 that it is not a good map because it does not give the names that we have been hearing from you. However, the witness may convert it into a map by making markings on it, a map that we can understand.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, we sent a request for a new, more distinct map to Moscow -to be sent from Moscow, with the scales corresponding to the scale of the map attached to the agreement between Molotov and TOGO and not reduced five times.

THE PRESIDENT: Try him on the map attached

5

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: This is a matter of great importance, and could not the parties agree on some map or copies of the map to be marked by witnesses?

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, if you will allow me and if the defense will have no objections, I can produce a more distinct scetch map to be marked by the witness. I may produce an excerpt from the map of the Red Army General Staff.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless he marks the map, his evidence will not be of great assistance, and yet we carnot let him mark the originals.

Can you pass from this to another subject while you are attempting to get an agreement on some man or maps? It is suggested to me, Colonel, that it is useless to mark on a map of such a scale as this. It is too diminutive. It should be on a much bigger scale.

COLONIL SLIRNOV: May I ask the Court for permission to produce an enlarged copy of this map in the form of a sketch map on which the witness can make his markings, as well as other witnesses?

THE PRESIDENT: That is just what we want, Colonel.

1 2

12<sub>3</sub>

out using filters and that is why the river itself is hardly distinct on this map. We tried to make for the Court new copies of the map, but we were not given the exhibit to make photo copies of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, with all respect, I suggest that we are wasting time in listening to this witness being cross-examined without the assistance of maps which show the places to which he refers and to which you refer, Colonel.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, then may the witness be shown the original copy of exhibit 767?

THE PRESIDENT: I understand from my colleagues who have made a careful study of the map attached to exhibit No. 767 that it is not a good map because it does not give the names that we have been hearing from you. However, the witness may convert it into a map by making markings on it, a map that we can understand.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, we sent a request for a new, more distinct map to Moscow -to be sent from Moscow, with the scales corresponding to the scale of the map attached to the agreement between Molotov and TCGO and not reduced five
times.

THE PRESIDENT: Try him on the map attached

2

,

-

5

6

/

c

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23 24

23,054

23,054

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: This is a matter of great importance, and could not the parties agree on some map or copies of the map to be marked by witnesses?

allow me and if the defense will have no objections,
I can produce a more distinct scetch map to be marked
by the witness. I may produce an excerpt from the
map of the Red Army General Staff.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless he marks the map, his evidence will not be of great assistance, and yet we carnot let him mark the originals.

Can you pass from this to another subject while you are attempting to get an agreement on some man or maps? It is suggested to me, Colonel, that it is useless to mark on a map of such a scale as this. It is too diminutive. It should be on a much bigger scale.

colonil Shirnov: May I ask the Court for nermission to produce an enlarged copy of this map in the form of a sketch map on which the witness can make his markings, as well as other witnesses?

THE PRESIDENT: That is just what we want, Colonel.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12<sub>3</sub>

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

.	COLONEL SMINNOV: Yes, sir.
2	BY COLONEL SMIRNOV (Continued):
3	Now, Mr. Witness, will you tell me about
4	the strength of the units included into the 6th Army?
5	Was the whole strength of the 23rd and 7th Divisions
6	included into this army?
7	A All of the 23rd Division, part of the 7th
8	Division.
9	& Besides, was the Manchurian Mixed Infantry
10	Brigade included into this army?
11	A They were tur'ir my command, but
12	I did not get to direct the commanding of them.
13	Were also three regiments of the Bargut
14	Cavalry under your command?
15	A Yes, I believe they were.
16	Q Did the army include three regiments of
17	heavy artillery?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Were not all Anti-Tank Batteries of the
20	1st Infantry Division attached to the units under
21	your command?
22	A In the course of the fighting from the 20th
23	of August to the 30th, because our forces were in an
24	unfavorable position, we received reinforcements from
4)	

time to time from the Kwantung Army.

3

4

5

7

8

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Was not a part of the heavy artillery from the Port Arthur Fortress sent to the units under your command? A No. Lo you remember the numbers of the regiments included in the army? I do not know. Q I will try to refresh your memory. Were not the 71st, 72a, 64th, 28th, 27th and 26th and 25th Infantry Regiments included in the army? The last two regiments were reinforcements sent later. The other regiments of which you spoke 13 were all under my command. Q Were not the 71st and 28th Infantry Regiments 14 dislocated to the south of Hailastyn River which flows into Khalkhin-Gol River, and the 72d and 64th and 26th Regiments to the north of the said river, on the eastern bank of the Khalkhin-Gol River? Α Yes. How many planes were attached to the Japanese

units during these military operations?

Under my command there was a liaison company as well as airplanes which served as ambulances. However, we had air forces cooperating with us -- we had some air forces.

THE MONITOR: "Some planes," rather. 1 4 I ask you another question: Lidn't the special or separate army group participate in the Afighting in the Nomonhan area on the Japanese side? A Since they were not under my command, I do 6 not know. Was not the first separate tank group attached 8 to the Japanese units during the operations in the 9 Nomonhan area? A From the 20th to the 30th, our army had no 11 tanks. Was not a separate tank group attached to the 13 units under your command? A No, they did not participate in the fighting. Then, maybe they were not used in the fighting itself, but they were at the disposal of the command of the army? A No, they were not. They were not under my 19 command. 20 When you arrived to the area of fighting on the 24th of August, the Japanese system of the army group defense south of the Hailastyn-Gol River had been already 24 broken; was it not so? A It was not yet broken. From around the 27th,

various points held by our army began to be destroyed.

River?

Were not the fighting operations of the Soviet 1 and Mongolian forces in the period from August 20 to August 24 -- to August 30, directed on the encirclement of the Japanese units which were east of the Khalkhin-Gol 4

A Yes.

And the Soviet troops which started the encirclement, both the troops of the Soviet units connected in the area of Nomongan-Burd-Obo, was it not so?

Since the area in which the fighting took place was a wide, grassy plain, among the various points of our army some were encircled and in some their line of defense was broken. However, the army as a whole was not encircled at one spot.

I ask you slightly another question: I ask you whether the Soviet and Mongolian forces could advance farther than the point called Nomongan-Burd-Obo, where two tank groups of the Soviet troops joined each other?

The Soviet forces came attacking us in scattered groups and they did not make a concentrated attack against our forces at one point. Myself, OGISU, the Commander of the Sixth Army, had my command point at a point southwest of Obo and was able to keep that position to the end.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

19 20

21

22

23

At any rate, the Soviet and Mongolian forces did not advance farther than the Nomongan-Burd-Obo -to the east of the Nomongan-Burd-Obo; to the east of it? 3 4 On the whole, they did not advance. 5 COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, may I ask the Court to mark for identification a map published by the Soviet General Staff in 1935, and prepared for publication in 1934? 9 THE PRESIDENT: You may have it marked for 10 identification. 11 CLERK OF THE COURT: The map made by the USSR 12 and published in 1935 will receive exhibit No. 2657 13 for identification only. (Thereupon, the document above

referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2657 for identification.)

T .E PRESIDENT: No map will be any good to us, Colonel, unless the names are in English. And, further, some of these places have two names. We would like to have both names on each map used.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, the copies of the parts of this map pertaining to the area of the fighting will be distributed to the Court right now.

THE PRESIDENT: Until the witness in some way marks it or acknowledges it, we cannot really accept

14

17

18 19

21

General Staff?

it as evidence. However, I see no harm in giving the Members of the Court copies of the map, in the belief or in the hope that the witness will use the map and mark places on it, subject to any objection by the prosecution.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, now may the witness be shown, as well as the copy of this map, both the copy of this map and the original prepared by the

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Mr. Witness, do you know topographical signs?
I ask you to use the original, the big map.

A On the whole I feel I can distinguish topographical signs.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

General Staff?

it as evidence. However, I see no harm in giving the Members of the Court copies of the map, in the belief or in the hope that the witness will use the map and mark places on it, subject to any objection by the prosecution.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, now may the witness be shown, as well as the copy of this map, both the copy of this map and the original prepared by the

(Thereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Wr. Witness, do you know topographical signs?
I ask you to use the original, the big map.

A On the whole I feel I can distinguish topographical signs.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International K a 1 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. p 2 THE PRESIDENT: Colonel smirnov. e 3 a COLONEL SMIRNOV: Yes, your Honor. 4 BY COLONEL SMIRNOV (Continued): & so, Mr. Witness, may I draw your attention W to the topographical signs on the original of the map. 8 THE PRESIDENT: He is now looking at exhibit 9 2657, tendered for identification only. 10 11 12

Q (Continuing) Mr. Witness, I ask you to pay attention to the topographical signs on the original of the map and not on the topographical signs which are on the copy of the map. These signs, if I remember correctly, are on the right-hand corner at the bottom of the map. Have you found these topographical signs?

A Yes.

Q Is it absolutely clear to you, Mr. Witness, how the frontier line is marked on this map?

A I can see the Russian border.

Q Do you know well that the state frontier lines are marked on the map by a broken line consisting of dashes and dots?

A I have heard the borderline was so decided

18

13

15

22

23 24

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

after the Molotov-TOGO negotiations. Q No. In this case I speak about quite another matter, Mr. Witness. Is it clear to you how the frontier lines are marked on the maps? I suppose the lines marked by dots and dashes is that borderline. COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, may I ask the Russian-Japanese interpreter to show the witness the line by which the frontier is marked? THE FRESIDENT: You had better point it out to him and let us see what you are pointing out, Colonel. If it is merely a line on a map you can indicate it with your finger. (Whereupon, Colonel smirnov indicated to witness.) THE INTERPRETER: The witness said "I do not understand." COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I have shown to the witness three markings on the map, and I can now by some way show them to the Tribunal also -in some way show them to the Tribunal also.

THE PRINT: Well, let us see what you

showed the witness. Bring the map that he looked

at to us. Let Mr. Blakeney come with you because

he observed what you showed the witness.

23 24

That map, of course, is not yet in evidence. Subject to any objections we will look at this now.

What was pointed out to the witness?

Colonel Smirnov says the borderline was pointed out or the indications thereof in the legend at the foot of the map. Colonel Smirnov, in the presence of Major Blakeney, will point out the part of the map indicated by Colonel Smirnov to the witness to all the Judges.

(Whereupon, Colonel smirnov indicated to the Hembers of the Tribunal.)

THE PRESIDENT: (Continuing) He has been asked to toint out what has been pointed out to the witness so we may test the witness' credibility, and there is no objection by the parties to the parts pointed out to the witness being indicated to us.

(Addressing Colonel Smirnov) You had better go back to the lectern and ask the witness whether he now understands.

COLONEL SITEMOV: Your Ponor, as far as
I understood, the witness told that he didn't
understand the marking made in the right corner at the
foot of the map.

THE PRESIDENT: He may not understand the writing if it isn't Japanese writing. I don't know what that writing is.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Might I be permitted, your wonor, to let the Japanese-Russian interpreter translate this inscription to the witness?

THE PRESIDENT: I see no objection unless the parties do. What the Russo-Japanese interpreter says to the witness must be interpreted
in English immediately, so the interpreter must
speak out loudly.

(Whereupon, the reading of the Russo-Japanese interpreter was translated as follows:)

THE MONITOR: "This map was drawn up by the map section at Rostov in 1934, and the drafting of this map was completed in 1935 by the map section in Moscow."

THE PRESIDENT: That isn't what you wanted him to read, is it?

COLONEL SMIRNOV: No, your Honor. I

asked him to translate this inscription, which certifies the year in which the map was published.

THE PRESIDENT: I thought you wanted the interpreter to read to the witness in Japanese the description of those markings in the legend which you say are the borderline, so that he might trace thereafter on the map the borderline as represented by your side.

COLONEL SPIRNOV: Your Honor, now I am going to ask this question: May I be allowed to ask
him whether he understands how the frontier lines
are marked on the map? It seems to me that now he
understands it.

THE PRESIDENT: He may understand it. You can ask him a question on that assumption.

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV:

O Mr. Witness, do you understand in what way the frontier line is marked on this map?

A I said so. I said what I thought to be the borderline a few minutes ago. I told you what I thought to be the borderline a few minutes ago.

Q Now I ask you to look at the original of the map and the copy of the portion of the map which you have, and to find out whether the copy of the map coincides fully with the original of

2

3

1

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

1	
1	the map. Tave you found this place on the map?
2	A Yes, I found it.
3	Now I ask you whether in the main this
4	sketch map, this copy, corresponds with the original
5	THE PRESIDENT: In respect of that marking
6	which is represented to be the borderline.
7	A I suppose it is what corresponds to the
8	original.
9	O Will you answer the following question, Mr.
10	"itness? Do you see the river Khalkin-Gol?
11	A Yes, I can see it.
12	O Do you see the Boir Lake?
13	A Yes, I can distinguish it.
14	O Do you see the line consisting of dashes
15	and dots, that is, the broken line by which the
16	state border is marked?
17	A Yes.
18	
19	

Morse & Spratt

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Q May I ask you, Mr. Vitness, to mark with pencils of different colors the following lines: the line of the river in blue pencil and the border line in red pencil.

MR. BLAKFNFY: I assume that counsel means the border line as shown on this map:

THE PRESIDENT: So do we.

COLONIL SMIRNOV: Yes, your Honor.

Q Have you marked these places, these lines?

A Did you ask me to mark in black the border line as asserted by the Soviet side?

Q Yes, Mr. Witness. I ask you to mark the line without your personal view of the question; only from the point of view of how it is on the map.

A The border line is already clearly indicated on that map, isn't it?

Q May I see the map with your markings? Now, Mr. Witness, will you tell me is the border line shown on the map issued by the Russian General Staff in 1934 east of the Khalkhin-Gol River?

A I have just seen right now the border line as asserted by the Soviet side.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: I don't want to argue with you whether you agree to it or not.

THE PRESIDENT: You should now tender that

15

16

17

19 20

21

23

exhibit and the copy finally. COLONIL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I would like to 2 ask several questions, ask the witness several questions 3 and have him mark several places on the map, and after 4 that I would like to tender this map if you permit. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. 6 Mr. "itness, is this River Hailastyn which 7 flows into the Khalkhin-Gol River, that river which 8 divided the area of the fighting into two parts? A Yes. 10 Will you tell me now did the fighting go 11 12 farther the point which is on this sketch map which is called Nomonghan-Burd-Obo -- farther than that point? 13 14 On the whole the fightingdid not go farther 15 than that. 16 Q So the farthest point which was reached by 17 the Soviet and Mongolian troops was Nomonghan-Burd-13 Obo, was it so? 19 Since we were extended on a wide front, I do 20 not believe that any forces were concentrated at one 21 point. 22 I did not ask you about that. I asked you 23

24

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he said they did not.

whether the Soviet and Mongolian troops went farther

than the point called Nom nghan.

Now I will ask you to mark by a cross sign 1 the point called Nomonghan. 2 THE PRESIDENT: "ell, it is clearly visible 3 on this map. I don't know that we want it indicated 4 any further. Q Now, Mr. Witness, I ask you to mark with 6 colored pencil the entire territory on the east bank of the Khalkhin-Gol River on which the fighting occurred 8 during the events of the Nomonghan Incident. 9 THE PRESIDENT: What colored pencil is he 10 using? I suppose we can find out in any event. 11 COLONEL SMIRNOV: He uses blue pencil, your 12 13 Honor. A I have indicated the battle lines of the two 14 opposing forces as of the 27th and 28th of August. 15 16 The blue line indicates the Japanese side; the red line 17 the Soviets. 13 COLONIL SMIRNOV: May I see what your markings 19 are? May I be allowed to do that, your Honor? 20 THE PRESIDENT: You may. 21

24

25

22

23

Witness.)

Q Mr. Witness, will you tell me now whether the fighting went beyond even one of the points in the area

(Whereupon, the map was handed to

Colonel Smirnov and then returned to the

beyond the border line which is marked on the map of the general staff of 1934?

A Because I think this is something that happens always in any battle and I believe that at some points the Soviets crossed the border -- their so-called border -- at some points they were to the west of that border. Since the whole area was a wide, grassy plain with hardly any landmarks, it is very difficult to determine where the actual border is, and although the border line is indicated clearly on that map, if you go to the area it is just a wide, empty open plain;

Q "ill you tell me then, according to the marks which you made on the map all the fighting occurred on the territory to the west of the border line shown on the map of the general staff?

the border line is not marked on this plain.

A On the whole, yes.

Q Vill you tell me when the hostilities ceased in this area and the truce was signed?

A I believe it was on the 16th of September that the truce agreement was signed.

Q And will you tell me whether the parties engaged remained in the positions approximately corresponding to the border line which you showed on the map today -- this morning?

A A Yes.

\_\_\_\_

q "ill you tell whether the territory under dispute was after the truce had been signed, remained after the truce had been signed on the Mongolian territory, was it not?

A Since by that time I had already left the field of operations I don't know.

COLONEL SLIRNOV: Your Monor, now may I tender in evidence the original of the map of the General Staff, the copies of that map, and the copy which contains the markings made by the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

map as a map; nor have I any objection to the markings made by the witness for whatever value they
have. But there having been considerable discussion
about border lines as shown on the map and about dates,
I do object to the extent that that is offered as
hearsay testimony, to its reception in evidence without
some supporting certificate of authenticity or origin.

THE PRESIDENT: To the extent that the witness has marked these maps we accept them as evidence. We quite understand they come from the prosecution's side, and he has accepted nothing as to their accuracy.

1R. BLAKENEY: Of course, I assume that in all cases of this sort full distribution of copies

OGISU CROSS

will be made in the usual way as time permits.

THE PRESIDENT: Our rules affecting documents apply to this.

The map and the copy before the witness are admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The map from exhibit 2657 is now received in evidence, and the copy of the map of said exhibit together with the witness' markings will receive exhibit No. 2657-A.

(Whereupon, the map attached to exhibit 2657 was received in evidence, a copy of the map with the witness' markings being marked exhibit 2657-A and received in evidence.)

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, May I ask a last question?

THE PRESIDENT: Certainly.

Q Mr. Witness, I will give you another copy of this sketch map and ask you to shade the area east of Khalkhin Golr River which was considered to be under dispute.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, I do think this is a frightful waste of time. The area under dispute is plainly shown by the evidence to be

1 2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

13

19 20

21

22

24

the area between the border claimed by the USSR as marked on this map and the boundary claimed by Japan, 2 which has been stated to be the Halkhin River. 3 4 THE PRESIDENT: At present we see no reason for that, Colonel. 6 COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, if this 7 question is absolutely clear I withdraw my question. 8 THE PRESIDENT: I do not know -- I will not 9 speak on behalf of all the members of the Tribunal 10 as to what is clear, but we do not want this question 11 put. It does not help us. 12 COLONEL SHIRNOV: Then I withdraw my question, 13 your Honor. 14 COLONDL SMIRNOV: That is all, your Honor. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney. 16 MR. BLAKENEY: In the course of cross-examina-17 tion counsel put to the witness statements allegedly 18 made by him and purporting to be read from a document 19 issued by him. I ask, in accordance with our rules, 20 that that document be tendered for identification. 21 THE PRESIDENT: That should be done, Colonel 22 Smirnov. 23 COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I can't quite 24 understand what documents my learned colleague means. 25

It may be if he will indicate them --

THE PRESCIDENT: It is a document that you appeared to read from yesterday afternoon. I recollect it distinctly. You read two sentences, I think. It appeared to come from an order issued by the Commanding General on the Japanese side.

your Honor. I actually read two sentences. I read them out of the transcript of proceedings of October 16, 1946. These are excerpts from exhibit 766. The point is, your Monor, that in the order of the Commander of this army group -- correction, please -- that in the report made by General Zhukov, Commander of this army group, a large portion of the Commander of the Sixth Army was quoted -- a large portion of the order of the Commander of the Sixth Army was quoted. By the questions I asked yesterday I wanted to identify this document. As the witness said that he didn't remember these proclamations made by him I passed to other questions and probably will have to identify this document in some other way.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess until helf-past one.

("Lereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

Whalen & Selzer

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. Hon. Ju-to Mei, Member from the Republic of Chine not sitting.

MARSHALL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

R I P P E I O G I S U, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

WR. BL/KENEY: I have a few questions in reexamination.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

my explanation concerning the quotations which I made yesterday during the cross examination. The only question I have is concerning the reproduction of the parts of the map attached to Exhibit 767. If the Court will think it expedient to have this map produced and processed, we would like to have a Court order concerning the possibility of having this Exhibit 767 for one day to make the enlarged

copies of the map and to process it. That is all I wanted to say. 2 THE PRESIDENT: I think that my colleagues have enough maps now. They do not seem to want any 4 more. 5 Major Blakeney, have you any objection to the witness marking on that map, the copies of the map that he last produced, where he contends the boundary was between Manchuria and Outer Mongolia? 9 Refore you answer me, I know what the Japanese contention is about that. MR. BLAKENEY: I have no objection whatever, your Honor. Then I ask that the witness be handed 13

Exhibit 2657-A in order that he may mark on it the boundary between Mongolia and Manchuria according to the Japanese contention.

("hereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

## REDILECT EXAMINATION

## BY IR. BL/KENEY:

o Witness, do you require the original in order to find the point you wish to mark?

/ If I could have the map which I used on the field of battle I should be very happy. There ought to be a Japanese map of Greater East 'sia.

1

3

8

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

unfold it completely.

1	Q I am going to present you with a Japanese map
2	in a moment, but for the time being, at the request
3	of the President, I should like you to mark on this
4	map, as well as you are able, where the boundary lay
5	according to the Japanese contention. Can you do that
6	A J shell. Shell I do it now?
7	? Yes, please. And I suggest marking it with
8	a dotted line, or in some other way, to distinguish it
9	from the other marks already made.
10	· A I have finished.
11	MR. BLAKENEY: Let the map be passed back to
12	the clerk, please.
13	' (Whereupon, the document was returned
14	to the clerk.)
15	Distribute blight i proceed.
16	THE PRESIDENT: Proceed.
17	MR. BLAKENEY: Just one more point in
10	connection with this metter. I ask that the witness
19	be shown Exhibit 2,653.
20	(Whereupon, a document was hended to
22	the witness.)
23	O Please look at that map, Mr. Witness, and
24	state what it is, if you know. You had better

I This is a Japanese map, scale 1:2,500,000 and is a map which I very frequently saw while on the field of battle. Q Can you find on that map a statement of the source and date? A Printed on 10 July 1937, published on 15 July 1937, copyrights, ownership rights and publication rights reserved by the publisher, the Land Survey Department of the Imperial Japanese / rmy. 

A This is a Japanese map, scale 1:2,500,000 and is a map which I very frequently saw while on the field of battle. Q Can you find on that map a statement of the source and date? A Printed on 10 July 1937, published on 15 July 1937, copyrights, ownership rights and publication rights reserved by the publisher, the Land Survey Department of the Imperial Japanese /rmy. 

Q From looking at that map can you tell the
Tribunal where it shows the boundary between Manchuria
and Mongolia in the Nomonhan area?

A May I state it?

Q Please do.

A From Lake Buir Nor to the lower reaches of the

A From Lake Buir Nor to the lower reaches of the Halha River to Handagaya the border runs along the line of the Halha River on the western bank. From Handagaya to the south there is a tributary of the Halha River which goes towards the south, and the border line goes to the south from there.

Q Then if I understand you correctly, in the Nomonhan area, that is to say in the area of the maps with which you were presented in cross-examination, the boundary is the Halha River. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Very well. Now, leaving the matter of maps,
I have one or two other points I wish to ask you about.

You state in cross-examination that generally speaking the Russian forces did not penetrate beyond the boundary claimed by them. Was that true of ground forces and air forces alike?

A As far as land forces were concerned, as far as large land forces were concerned they were more or less concentrated along the border line, as I have stated

1 2

3

.

6

7

9

11

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

before. However, I have heard -- it was reported to me by my subordinates that the Russian air force -- I heard in reports from my subordinates, as well as from my superiors, that the Russian air force had carried out large-scale attacks in the middle of June and in July on points far in the interior of Manchuria around Hailun Arshan and the Nonni River. While the land forces were carrying on their fighting when I was in that area I saw day after day dog fights going on between the Russian and Japanese air forces above the area on which we were fighting, and then I saw hussian planes going farther on into the interior of Manchuria.

I saw Russian planes daily strafing and bombing our positions in the rear, especially our line of communications from Hailar to Nomonhan was heavily bombed and strafed every day by the Russian airplanes, and severe damage was sustained along this line.

Q Among the official reports received by you from subordinates or superiors, was there mention of the fact that prior to your arrival as commander of the Sixth Army Soviet air forces had bombed other cities of Manchuria?

A As I have just stated, I have heard that large-scale attacks were carried out on Halun Arshan

1 2

25

.	and the Nonni River.
1	Q What I meant was, were any other cities bombed
2	in addition to those you have already mentioned?
3	A Ganchjur-Sumu was also bombed. A place called
5	Ganchjur-Sumu was also bembed.
6	Q Did you receive any reports of the bombing
7	of the city of Tsitsihar?
8	A No.
9	Q Were the bombings by Soviet airplanes which
0	you have mentioned at points east of the line claimed
1	by the U.S.S.R. as the boundary?
2	A The points which I mentioned just now are
3	points far to the east of the line as finally decided
4	upon as the result of the TOGO-Molotov agreement.
5	Q And also were they to the east of the line
6	claimed by the U.S.S.R. at that time as the boundary?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Now, my last point. Can you state approximatel
9	the strength of the Soviet forces at the time you were
0	in command of the Sixth Army?
1	A We estimated the Russian forces which crossed
2	the Halha kiver on the 19th of August to total three
3	infantry divisions, several artillery brigades, five

hundred tanks and two hundred sirplanes.

MR. BLAKENEY: No further questions.

May the witness be excused on the usual terms? THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) 

L f 1 e r & D u

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. BLAKENEY: Inasmuch as I am informed that the Clerk now has copies of defense document No. 240 which I attempted to offer yesterday, I again renew the offer of that document.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The prosecution objects to this document as being immaterial, your Honor. The only part of it dealing with the USSR is the last paragraph on page 2 and the greater part of page 3, and that merely recapitulates other evidence which either has been given or is on the list to be given of a more direct character with regard to the matters with which it deals. The rest of the document dealing with other matters contains nothing new or important, and in our submission the reading of it would be merely a waste of time.

17

13

19

20

21

MR. BLAKENEY: I had proposed reading the last paragraph on page 2 of the document. Evidence has already been introduced of Japanese efforts toward demarcation of the boundary prior to the Nomonhan Incident. The excerpt in question confirms that the same policy was being pursued by the Japanese Government after the Nomonham Incident and that that policy was in a 25 measure crowned with success. I should have thought that if we had a case of disputed boundary, it would be

clearly material to see which of the parties to the dispute had urged the solution of it, material as bearing on the question of aggressive intent or the absence thereof.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal admits the document to the extent to which you have indicated, that
is, paragraph 2 on the second page -- the last paragraph on the second page, which runs over into about
the middle of the third page. The objection is overruled to that extent. It is admitted on the usual
terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 240 will receive exhibit No. 2658.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2658 and received in evidence in part.)

MR. BLAKENEY: This is the address by Foreign Minister ARITA to the liet on the 1st of February, 1940.

I read the last paragraph on page 2:

"The Japanese Government have always desired to adjust relations with the U.S.S.R. and so contribute toward ensuring the peace of East Asia as a whole. More recently, international feeling between the two countries having taken a turn for the better, we are planning to seek concrete and practical solutions of the principal

questions now pending, and a consequent general adjustment of Soviet-Japanese relations. With regard to the boundary questions, a truce agreement was signed last autumn in connection with the Nomonhan Incident; and since last December a temporary Manchoukuo-Mongolia boundary commission, representing the countries concerned, has been set up for the purpose of delimiting the precise boundary line in the disputed areas. The Japanese Covernment are now negotiating for the early establishment of commissions, with a view to delimiting boundaries, not only in the Nomonhan area but also all along the frontier between Manchoukuo and Soviet territory, for the prevention of boundary disputes and for the peaceful solution of all possible international contentions in the frontier districts, so as to bring tranquility to all sectors of the Manchoukuo-Mongolia and Manchoukuo-Soviet frontiers."

As my next witness, to testify concerning the diplomatic aspects of the Nomonhan Incident, I call OTA, Saburo.

22

21

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

1	S A B U R O O T A, called as a witness on
2	behalf of the defense, being first duly
3	sworn, testified through Japanese inter-
4	preters as follows:
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. BLAKENEY:
7	Q Please state your name, occupation and resi-
8	dence.
9	A My name is OTA, Saburo. My address is
10	200 Nakazato-cho, Yokosuka City. My profession is
11	Mayor of Yokosuka City.
12	MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be
13	handed defense document 1581.
14	(Whereupon, a document was handed
15	to the witness.)
16	Q I ask you to examine that document and state
17	whether it is your affidavit.
18	THE PRESIDENT: He is not asked to read the
19	whole of it.
20	Q Without reading it at this time, can you
21	identify it as being your affidavit?
22	A On the whole I think I can.
23	Q I understand that you have a correction which
24	you wish to make and which I presume you are now hunting
25	A I do not believe there is any correction to be
	a 1 do not betteve there is any correction to be

made.

2

3

1

Very well. Are the contents of the document true and correct?

4

A As far as I have read, it is true and correct.

THE MONITOR: As far as I have read so far.

5

6

Q Well, was the whole thing true and correct when you signed it?

7 8

A Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

IR. BLAKENEY: Before offering the document,
I wish to refer the Tribunal to exhibit 2630, the
testimony of ISONO, Yuzo, exhibit 2632, that of HAYASHI,
Kaoru, and exhibit 2637, that of MATSUDAIRA, Koto, concerning the destruction and present non-availability
of certain documents referred to in the testimony of

15 16

17

18

19

Mr. OTA.

I wish also to call attention to one or two corrections in the English version of the affidavit, to-wit, on page 2, the second paragraph, the first line, the 9th of September should be the 10th of September according to the Japanese original. And on page 3, the fourth line from the bottom, the scale of the map should be 1 to 100,000, rather than 1,000,000.

21 22

The affidavit, defense document 1581, is offered in evidence.

24

25

23

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

made.

Q Very well. Are the contents of the document true and correct?

A As far as I have read, it is true and correct.

THE MONITOR: As far as I have read so far.

Q Well, was the whole thing true and correct when you signed it?

A Yes.

MR. BLAKENEY: Before offering the document, I wish to refer the Tribunal to exhibit 2630, the testimony of ISONO, Yuzo, exhibit 2632, that of HAYASHI, Kaoru, and exhibit 2637, that of MATSUDAIRA, Koto, concerning the destruction and present non-availability of certain documents referred to in the testimony of Mr. OTA.

I wish also to call attention to one or two corrections in the English version of the affidavit, to-wit, on page 2, the second paragraph, the first line, the 9th of September should be the 10th of September according to the Japanese original. And on page 3, the fourth line from the bottom, the scale of the map should be 1 to 100,000, rather than 1,000,000.

The affidavit, defense document 1581, is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, the defense document 1581 is drawn up in such a manner that it is impossible to understand whether the witness directly participated in the events -- in the negotiations, or if he only judges about them on hearsay. If the last be correct, then it will turn out that the witness in his affidavit is trying to be an expert, or to act like an expert, on the questions involved in the negotiations, or about the causes of the incidents, and about the historic determination of the state border line. It is clear that both these questions are cut of the scope of competence of a former second-rate official of the embassy, and that part of the affidavit has no probative value.

The balance of the affidavit deals with matters which can be established only by way of introduction of documents or in case they do not exist, by testimony of the participants in the events. These matters include telegrams allegedly received by TOGO from Tokyo and dealing with the negotiations conducted by TOGO in Moscow or with the work of the commission for redemarcation.

Besides, this affidavit contains numerous repetitions concerning questions which have no importance. The reading of the affidavit as it is will be

```
a waste of time.
1
             On these grounds, I ask to reject document
 2
   1581 in its entirety.
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
a waste of time.
 1
             On these grounds, I ask to reject cocument
 2
    1581 in its entirety.
 3
 4
 5
 6
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If any of counsel's points were well taken, the question would be, as he said, one of probative value of the document which as this Tribunal has often said will be considered as a question of weight and not of admissibility. Such questions are proper matter for cross-examination. As for the allegation that the witness is not shown to know personally whereof he speaks, I point out that in paragraph 2 of the affidavit he states that he was in charge of the matters herein discussed. The attempt to inject again the question of the absence of documents need, I think, not be referred to further in as much as the exhibits already mentioned are fully explanatory of the matter.

THE PRESIDENT: As Mr. Ballantine was allowed to give evidence of negotiations at which he was present, I suppose you claim this man should be allowed to give evidence of the negotiations at which he was present.

MR. BLAKENEY: Of course, we contend that any participant, for that matter, any hearer, can report the contents of conversations, but even had the witness not been present, in view of his official

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

19

21

23

24

25

status and official duties in connection with the matter, he could still testify to it. That is one of the well known exceptions to the hearsay rule.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court overrules the objection and admits the document.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1581 will receive exhibit No. 2659.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense document No. 2659 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the document, omitting formal parts:

"I served as Third Secretary to the Japanese Embassy in Moscow from May 1938, serving under Ambassador TOGO after he assumed his office in Moscow in October 1938. Ambassador TOGO left Moscow for home in October 1940, and I also left for home in the same month. During that period, the Nomonhan Incident occurred in May 1939 and diplomatic negotiations were conducted for its solution. From about August of the same year, I was in charge of handling the negotiations under Ambassador TOGO.

"The Nomonhan Incident occurred because of the fact that the border between Manchoukuo and the Mongolian People's Republic was not clearly defined

2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by the two countries but was merely a border line of administrative districts in the Ching Empire. The incident began when some Cuter-Mongolian forces crossed the Khalkha River, which Lanchoukuo believed to be the boundary between Manchoukuo and Mongolia, and entered into the territory of Manchoukuo in lay 1939. The Japanese forces as well as the forces of lanchoukuo were obliged to counter-attack in order to secure the border-line, and pressed the Cuter-Mongolian forces to the south of the Khalkha River. The forces of the Soviet Union and Mongolia were reinforced and tried to recover the area. Protests were meanwhile lodged mutually by the Governments of Japan and the Soviet Union. Japan and Manchoukuo aimed at maintaining the Khalkha River as the border line, but the reinforcement of the Soviet-Mongolian forces continued and their military action came to be large-scale, so that it was difficult to seize an opportunity to start negotiations for the solution of the incident, in spite of the desire of Japan to settle it promptly and to restore normal relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. However, on 22 August, when Ambassador TCGO, at an interview with Deputy Foreign Commissar Lozovsky on the question of the Morthern Sakhalin concessions, stressed

.

the necessity of solving various pending questions, Mr. Lozovsky stated that the Soviet Union also desired the normalization of Soviet-Japanese relations. Thereupon Ambassador TCGO took the opportunity to urge upon him that it was essential to solve, together with other questions, the frontier questions between Manchoukuo and the Soviet Union as well as those between Manchoukuo and Mongolia, in order to improve relations between the two countries. To this, Deputy Commissar Lozovsky replied that the Soviet Union would study any concrete proposal of Japan regarding the boundary problem, indicating that the Soviet Union also desired to solve the incident through diplomatic negotiations.

"Accordingly, Ambassador TCGO exchanged telegrams with Tokyo, and having received the concrete instructions which the Japanese Government sent after consultation with the Manchoukuo Government, met Commissar Molotov on 9 September. He expressed to the Commissar the desire of the Japanese Government to solve various pending issues between the two countries with mutual good-will in order to improve general relations, and conveyed to the Commissar that (1) it was proposed to determine the Manchoukuo-Soviet and Manchoukuo-Mongolian

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

border; (2) there was no objection to the establishment of a commission for the solution of border disputes; and (3) a commercial treaty would readily be negotiated. In response to Ir. Molotov's query as to the disputes which the commission as proposed in (2) was to consider, Ambassador T(GC told the Commissar that the Nomonhan Incident should be solved as soon as possible because the adjustment of relations would be difficult if further conflict were to develop in Nomonhan. Replying to the further query as to the Japanese proposal for the solution of the incident, Mr. TOGO explained in detail the Japanese proposal for demilitarizing the disputed area with a view to avoiding further conflict and contributing to the improvement of relations between the two countries.

"At the second meeting of 10 September,
Commissar Moletov stated to Ambassador TOGO (1)
that the demarcation of the Manchoukuo-Soviet and
Manchoukuo-Mongolian border and the establishment
of a commission for the solution of border disputes
were considered appropriate, but that such a commission should handle disputes on land which might occur
in future as well as invasion of territorial waters
in Kamchatka and Salhařin; (2) that the conclusion

of a treaty of commerce was desired; and (3) that as to the Momonhan Incident, it was the intention of the Soviet Union to restore the status prevailing before the incident and to solve the incident by withdrawing forces of both parties to the line contended for by the Soviet Mongolians, and that it was considered that that line should be established as the legitimate line inasmuch as it had been fixed for years and that therefore the establishment of a demilitarized zone was not deemed reasonable.

"Ambassador TCGO replied to the Commissar that (1) he would reply to the Russian proposal for extending the competence of the above-mentioned commission to Kamchatka and Sakhalin after consultation with his government; that (2) as to the .

Nomenhan Incident, the Outer-Mongolian forces had started to invade the Nomenhan area, where they had never been stationed before March or April of this year, and the disputes spread after May; that according to the Russian proposal of the restoration of the original status, the Soviet-Mongolian forces were to retreat to the left bank of the Khalkha River and so there was not much discrepancy between the Russian and Japanese proposals; and that the Japanese proposal offered to establish a demilitarized area in

spite of the fact that the Japanese-Manchoukuoan forces had been stationed in the Nomonhan area even before the incident.

"Commissar Molotov insisted that it had to be clarified that it was not 'demarcation' of the border but was 'redemarcation' thereof, and repeated that the border-line that had existed prior to the incident should be restored and that upon securing Japan's agreement to it the Russian forces would retreat to the line. Ambassador TOGO asserted that Japan could not accept the Soviet proposal because Manchoukuo believed the Nomonhan area to be her territory, insisting at the same time upon the necessity of solving the incident and calming down the tense atmosphere prevailing on the spot.

DIRECT

1

e 2 e 3 b 3

G

r g 5 & 6

& 6 B 7 a r 8 t

o n

10

9

12

11

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

25

"At the third meeting of 14 September, Ambassador TOGO offered a compromise plan in which it was proposed that the status prevailing prior to May 1 1939 should be restored and that both forces should cease hostilities for this purpose. Although Mr. TOGO explained that the Japanese proposal was generally in agreement with the Soviet proposal except that it did not include the problem of the border line, Mr. Molotev insisted that Japan should recognize the Soviet assertion that the line upheld by the Soviet-Mongolians had existed prior to May 1. As Commissar Molotav insisted on his stand in a long discussion, Ambassador TOGO stated that so long as the Soviet Union did not agree to the proposal of restoration of the original status, the only solution should be to cease hostilities at a line held at a certain time and requested the Soviet Union for reply. The Commissar promised to consider the matter and make reply.

"At the fourth meeting of 15 September Commissar Molotov stated that the Soviet Union could accept the Japanese proposal of cessation of hostilities made the day before, and agreed thereto, and at the same time proposed a draft agreement on the establishment of a joint commission for border demar-

Manchoukuo on the one side and two representatives of the Soviet Union and Mongolia on the other. Thereupon, the Commissar and the Ambassador consulted about the time of cessation of hostilities and related matters, as well as the joint commission for demarcation, and the agreement for the cessation of hostilities was concluded at about 2 A.M. of the 16th. It was also agreed that the form of the agreement should be oral instead of in writing. It was decided that the contents of the agreement were to be made public at 3 A.M. of the 16th in a joint communique, which is Defense Document No. 1570.

mission for the Manchoukuo-Mongolian border demarcation based on the agreement of cessation of hostilities EttNemenhan, negotiations were subsequently conducted between Ambassador TOGO and Foreign Commissar Molotov, and as a result, an agreement was reached between them on 19 November 1939. In accordance with the agreement, the representatives of Japan, Manchoukuo, the Soviet Union and Mongolia held eight conferences in Chita between 7 and 25 December, and another eight in Harbin between 5 and 30 January of the following year. The work of the commission for the demarcation of the

border in the Nomonhan area and the district south of Arshan River came to a deadlock because of differences of opinion after the studies in these sixteen conferences based on maps and documents of high authenticity.

"Although the discussions in these conferences foreshadowed the future of the negotiations,
Ambassador TOGO resumed the negotiations concerning
the matter around March of 1940, and had frequent
conferences with Commissar Molotov and other officers.
An agreement was finally reached between Mr. TOGO and
Mr. Molotov on 9 June relative to the border demarcation of the disputed area and determining the borderline on the map.

"The agreement concerning the demarcation of the border in the Nomonhan area, signed by Ambassador TOGO and Foreign Commissar Molotov on 9 June 1940, and the map attached thereto, have been submitted to the Tribunal by the prosecution as Exhibit No. 767. In the lower part of this map is the notation, 'The border line between the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchoukuo in the Khalkin Gol area prior to the agreement of 9 June 1940', and 'The Border line between the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchoukuo in the Khalkin Gol area according to the agreement of 9 June 1940'. Such markings, however, did not

12s

exist on the map attached to the agreement then signed. Before the TOGO-Molotov agreement there had never been in the disputed area any border line markings recognized by international agreement. Next to the abovementioned markings is written 'Scale 1:1,000,006' recall that at the time of the TOGO-Molotiv negotiations and maps of scale 1:1,000,000, prepared by the Kwantung Army, were used, but that at the time of the signing of the agreement the 1935 edition of scale 1:200,000, prepared by the Soviet Army General Staff, were used for the sake of convenience. The TOGO-Molotov agreement actually mentions this. I recall, furthermore, that that part of the disputed area which the Mongolian People's Republic ceded to Manchoukuo in accordance with the TOGO-Molotov agreement was the triangular area of the Harat Mountains and the narrow area south of the Arshan River, whereas Manchoukuo agreed to cede to the Mongolian People's Republic the area between the Khalkha River and the new boundary.

"In order to clarify on the ground the new boundary determined on the map, Ambassador TOGO and Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs Lozovsky made necessary arrangements on 18 July with regard to the consitution and duties of the border-detarcation commission on the spot. In accordance with the arrange-

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

13 19

20

21

23

24

ment the representatives of Manchoukuo and Mongolia held six conferences in Chita between 3 and 24 August and agreed upon technical matters, and started operations on the spot after the beginning of September.

Meanwhile, Ambassador TCGO was ordered home on 29 August and left Moscow on 20 October for home. I left for home, also, on 18 October.

"As the settlement of the Nomonhan Incident marked the beginning of normal relations between Japan and the Soviet Union, Ambassador TOGO deemed it proper to proceed to the conclusion of a nonaggression pact between the two countries, which had been his cherished desire. Toward the end of 1939 or the beginning of 1940 he strongly recommended the plan to the Tokyo Government. He sent Secretary SAITO home temporarily for the same purpose -- to persuade influential quarters. As a result, Ambassador TOGO obtained instructions from Foreign Minister ARITA for the nonclusion of a neutrality pact between the two countries, and commenced negotiations with Foreign Commissar Molotov, which made great progress. Agreement had been reached between them as to the gist of the draft pact when Ambassador TCCO was ordered home by Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, and he subsequently left Moscow.

"After I returned home, I served as chief of the Third Section, European-Asiatic Bureau. The operations on the spot concerning the border demarcation in the Nomonham area were practically at a standstill after December 1940, owing to disagreement of views between the Manchoukuoan and Mongolian representatives. However, immediately after the con-

1 2

3

4 5

6

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

clusion of the Neutrality Pact in April 1941 an agreement was reached between Ambassador TATEKAWA and Commissar Molotov that the operations on the spot should be concluded within the year 1941.

Accordingly, the representatives of Manchoukuo and Mongolia met in Chita after 18 May, and after reaching agreement on technical matters on 14 June, started operations on the spot on 27 June. The work was carried on in spite of the Soviet-German War, until it was completed on 17 August, when bordermarkers were established throughout the entire disputed area. The matter had been completely solved two years after hostilities ceased.

"The general protocol and documents attached, drawn by the border-demarcation commission on the ground, were signed in Harbin on 15 October. Although it had been agreed that the governments of Manchoukuo and Mongolia would recognize these documents by exchanging notes on 5 December, this failed to materialize because of procedural delays on the part of the Mongolian Government and for the convenience of the Government of the Soviet Union. The notification of the recognition of these documents was completed in Harbin on 15 May 1942."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: May I start cross-examination, your Honor?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY COLONEL SMIRNOV:

Q Mr. Witness, on page 1 of your affidavit you stated that since August, 1939 you, according to instructions, were in charge of the negotiations concerning the Nomonhan events. Should it be understood, then, that TOGO entrusted you with conducting the negotiations instead of himself?

A That is not so.

Q Did you conduct independently any negotiations with the representatives of the Soviet or the Mongolian sides?

A No.

Q Were you present at least one time at the negotiations between TOGO and the Soviet Government -- and the representatives of the Soviet Government?

A No.

Q Then, in what way were you concerned with the negotiations? Were you in charge of the negotiations?

A Before the negotiations were actually commenced, as Secretary of the Embassy, I conducted --

1 2

3

4 5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

I prepared for the negotiations. After the negotiations were concluded, on orders from Ambassador TOGO

I drafted the text of telegrams, reports and opinions to be sent to the Japanese Foreign Office.

Then you state the contents of these negotiations on the grounds of the words spoken by third persons.

A I am testifying to these negotiations on the basis of what I heard directly from Ambassador TOGO, himself, and also from the interpreter of the Embassy who was present at these negotiations. A portion of them I have seen with my own eyes. For instance, the problem of the maps which is included -- which I touch in my affidavit, this I saw -- I was directly concerned with it myself -- I saw it myself.

THE PESIDINT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Wolf & Kapleau

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Filitary Tribunal for the Far Fast is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV (Continued):

o Mr. Witness, I did not understand whether at least one time you were personally present at the negotiations between TOGO and the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.

A No, I was not present once.

Then, why did you state before the recess that you personally participated in the negotiations?

A What I did was to prepare for the negotiations before the negotiations were opened, and after the negotiations were over -- after the negotiations on Nomonhan were over, on instructions from Ambassador TOGO, to draft reports and telegrams embodying opinions of Ambassador TOGO to the Japanese Foreign Office; and I added to that statement, concerning the map to which I testified -- concerning the map or maps to which I testified in my affidavit. I personally saw them.

Mave you, for instance, one original document to which you refer in your affidavit -- for instance, telegrams to Tokyo or telegrams from

19

20

21

23

.	Tokyo or any other documents besides the Court ex-
1	
2	hibits?
3	A I do not have a single one now at my dis-
4	posal.
5	O Where were you at the time when the hos-
6	tilities in the Nomonhan area started
7	A I was in Moscow.
8	o Then, on what ground do you state in your
9	affidavit that the incident began when the Outer
10	Mongolian forces crossed the Khalgha River?
11	A I testified on the basis of my recollection
12	of a telegram received from the Foreign Office in
13	Japan at the time.
14	THE MONITOR: "Instructions" instead of
15	"telegram."
16	O Then, again you state from hearsay?
17	A If you call the Japanese Foreign Office
18	a third party, then I suppose you are correct.
19	But being in Moscow, you could hardly get
20	personal impressions about the events in the Noman-
21	han area?
22	THE PRESIDENT: Well, we know that he was
23	not at Nomonhan. We know that he is testifying,
24	to the Dellarting togething about negotia-

just as Mr. Ballantine testified, about negotia-

tions at which he was present or which he had a

25

dut	y to record or execute.
	COLONEL SMIRNOV: Then, I withdraw my
que	stion, your Honor.
	Q . Do you know when the hostilities started
in	the Nomonhan area?
	A As far as I can recollect, it was on
the	11th of May.
	And when, according to your words, did
TOG	O raise before Deputy Foreign Commissar Lozovsky
the	question of peaceful settling of the incident?
	A As is written in my affidavit, it was on
the	22nd of August.
	O Then, more than four months later?
	A According to my calculation, it is a little
ove	r three months.
	O Three months; that is quite correct.
	In your affidavit you write about the wish
of .	Japan to solve the incident and to establish
	mal relations with the Soviet Union. Is that so
	A Yes, that is so.
	Why, then, was it necessary to wait for
thre	ee months before starting first negotiations,
	n according to your words?

A In order to open negotiations we must await

a favorable moment. Concerning the Changkufeng

incident, which broke out the previous year,
Ambassador SHIGEMITSU received instructions from
the Foreign Office almost immediately after the
opening outbreak of the incident and tried to start
negotiations to settle the incident.

THE MONITOR: "Instructions from the Japanese Government" instead of "Foreign Office."

A (Continuing) But concerning the outbreak of the Nomonhan incident, we first heard of it by means of a protest from Commissar Molotov in Moscow to the Japanese Embassy there.

Furthermore, the Japanese forces which were involved in the Changkufeng incident of the previous year belonged to the Korean Army, whereas those involved in the Nomonhan incident belonged to the Kwantung Army.

O I am not interested in those details, Mr. Witness. Will you answer briefly?

So the 22nd of August you considered as a favorable moment for the beginning of the negotiations, is that so?

A I didn't decide that moment. It was Ambassador TOGO who decided this matter.

O Do you know that on the 20th of August the Soviet and Mongolian troops started decisive

1 2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

```
offensive operations?
1
         A I did not know of it at the time.
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Q And why was this moment favorable for the Japanese side as the time for the beginning of the negotiations?

A As is written in my affidavit, when Ambassador TOGO visited Deputy Commissar Lozovsky in order to take up the question of Japanese interests in North Karafu's the question of the settlement of the borderline was brought up and negotiations were thereupon commenced. I believe that when Ambassador TOGO visited Commissar Lazovsky he did not go there with the intention of taking up the question of the border. As far as I remember when Foreign Ninister -- when Ambassador TOGO visited Deputy Commissar Lazovsky on the question of Japanese interests in North Karafuto he did not go there with the intention of necessarily taking up the Nomonhan case also.

Q In your affidavit you wrote that the peaceful settlement of the conflict was prevented by
the fact that the reinforcements to the Foviet and
Mongolian troops were being continually sent in the
Nomonhan area; page one of your affidavit. Is that
correct?

A As far as I am aware, that is correct.

Q What then changed on the 22nd of August at

1 2

which date in the Nomonhan area there were the strongest number -- the largest number of the soviet troops and of fighting equipment?

A I am a foreign service officer and as such I know nothing about the military operations. All I knew was instructions and reports received and telegrams from the Foreign Office in Tokyo which stated that both forces were gradually reinforcing their armies and that the situation was developing as I have stated in my affidavit, and that a large-scale war was going to be waged.

THE MONITOR: "The Foreign Office" should be corrected to read "Home Government."

Q That is what I asked you; why you not being a military man and being not competent in military questions write them in your affidavit?

THE PRESIDENT: We know that he does not say that as a military man or as an expert.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Then, I pass on to my next question.

Q Could the Commission for the redemarcation, established after the agreement between Molotov and TOGO was signed, could this Commission change any of the main points which the agreement contained?

A I was not cuite able to get the purport of

1 2

3

4 5

6

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

13

19

20

22

23

24

## CROSS REDIRECT

	your question.
1	THE PRESIDENT: What were the powers of the
2	Commission? Could they change anything agreed
3	between Mr. Molotov and Mr. TOGO?
4	THE WITNESS: The Commission had no power
5	to change the agreement reached between Molotov
6	and TOGO and in fact they did not. It did not.
7	COLONEL SMIRNOV: No further questions, your
8	Honor.
9	THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.
11	IR. BLAKENEY: I ask leave of the Tribunal
12	to put one or two further questions with reference
13	to the identity of the document which possibly I
14	should have put in direct examination.
15	THE PRESIDENT: We give you permission.
16	R. BLAKENEY: Thank you, sir.
17	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY IR. BLAKENEY:
19	MR. BLAKENEY: I request that the witness
20	be handed a map marked defense document No. 1,161.
21	(Whereupon, the document above
22	referred to was handed to the witness.)
23	Q I ask you to examine that map and tell the
24	Tribunal if you know what it is?
25	A As far as I can recollect, this map is

a copy of the original map of the boundary between Outer Mongolia and Manchuria in the Nomonhan area as was agreed upon in the TOGO-Molotov agreement, which was drawn up by the Soviet Foreign Office and sent to our Embassy. This is a copy of the original which was -- This is a copy which was drawn up by the Foviet Foreign Office and sent to our Embassy.

Q Is it, so far as you remember, an exact copy of the original map attached to the TOGO-Molotov agreement?

A It is.

Q Does that map show the boundary line agreed upon in the TOGO-Molotov agreement?

A It does.

Q Does it show or purport to show any other boundary mark in addition thereto?

A since it was a map drawn up by the soviet side it also shows the boundary as asserted by the soviet side before the Nomonhan Incident.

Q Is there anywhere on that map any legend explaining the meaning of the lines drawn across the map?

· A There is nothing to indicate such a thing.

spratt & lors

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q In those respects, that is to say, the presence of the lines and the absence of a legend explaining them, is this map identical to the original map attached to the TOGO-Molotov Agreement?

A With the exception of the fact that the map does not include the initials of Mr. TOGO and Mr. Molotov I believe that it is an exact copy of the original. I am certain. I can say so with conviction.

Q Was the original map initialed by others in addition to Messrs. TOGO and Molotov?

A As far as I can recollect there were also the initials of the counsel to the ambassader in Moscow, CHIDA, and the Chief of the Second Far Eastern Division of the Soviet Foreign Office, Tsarapkin.

MR. BLAKENEY: I tender the map, document 1481, and ask that it be marked as an exhibit for identification.

COLONFL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I cannot understand what things are compared by the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Nor will we be able to even if it is tendered in evidence if there is no legend but just lines. For the time being it is tendered for identification only, and that is our ruling in these matters.

MR. BLAKENEY: I seem to have given two different

numbers for the document. The correct number is 1481.

CLFRE OF THE COURT: Defense document 1481

will receive exhibit No. 2660 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit

No. 2660 for identification.)

Q I ask now that the witness be handed prosecution exhibit 767. I ask that you look at the map attached to that exhibit, which is a cony of the TOGO-

tion exhibit 767. I ask that you look at the map attached to that exhibit, which is a comy of the TOGO-Molotov agreement, and state if you can whether the legend appearing on the paper pasted on the lower lefthand corner of that map was on the original map attached to the TOGO-Molotov Agreement.

A As formal I recollect, I can say with conviction that these caditional -- these superscriptions were not on the original map at all, the original map attached to the TOGO-Molotov (greement. Furthermore, as I stated in my affidavit, the map attached to the TOGO-Molotov (greement was a map of 1, to 2'0,000 whereas this map is on a scale of 1 to 1,000,000.

O At the time that conversations were commenced between Ambassador TOGO and Commissar Molotov with a view to settlement of the Nom when Incident had the embassy received any information concerning the so-called Soviet offensive of the 20th of August?

4 5

7 8

7

8 9

10

11 12

14

15

13

16

0

17 18

20

21

19

22 23

24

25

We did receive information to the effect that severe fighting was going on toward the end of August. However, we did not receive any information more detailed than that at the Japanese Embassy in Russia.

MR. BLAKENEY: No further question, but I assume cross-examination is again in order.

THE PRESIDENT: If desired. Colonel Smirnov. COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, can I ask a few questions in connection with the presentation of the new exhibit?

> THE PRESIDENT: You are at liberty to do so. RECROSS-IYAMINATION

COLONEL SMIRFOV: I ask the witness to be shown the last exhibit just tendered in evidence for identification and the map attached to prosecttion exhibit 767.

("hereupon, said maps were handed to the witness.) BY COLONEL SMIRNOV:

Q Mr. "itness, I ask you to look attentively at the small scale copy of the map and at the exhibit which has been tendered for identification -- bigger copy of the map. Do you see that on both maps there are two lines, one unbroken and one dotted line?

A Yes.

Q That is correct. Mr. Witness, is the dotted line on the big scale map printed in a typographical way, and the unbroken line is made with India ink or by some other color?

1 As you say.

Q Doesn't it seem to you that the dotted line
was, as it had been printed, was in the map earlier -was this dotted line, which is printed on the map,
was it on the map earlier than the unbroken line which
was put on the map at the moment of the signing of the
treaty?

A I agree with you. I think that is quite so.

(3)

3

5

6

7 8

9

11

12

14

16

17

(3)

19 20

21

23

25

Q Doesn't it seem to you that both maps, the large one and the smaller map, as far as the question of border lines is concerned -- I don't speak about other descriptions -- are absolutely identical?

A Unfortunately, I do not think so. The larger map, as far as I can recall, is an exact copy of the original map attached to the TOGO-Molotov Agreement. The smaller map, however, is not an exact copy of the original. that is to say, it is not the large reduced in scale, but it is an altogether different map.

There are a few differences in the geographical names between the two maps.

- Q Will you show me at anv rate one place on the map containing different geographical names?
- I may go into too much detail, and you may say again that you have no interest in what I am saying. May I proceed?

THE PRESIDENT: It is very important that you should show the difference in names, if you can.

Nor need you go into great detail. Two or three names will be sufficient. A single word may be sufficient to show the difference in that case.

THE WITNESS: In the larger map the river on the upper reach of the Khalkha River is marked the Khalkhin-Gol River; whereas, in the smaller map it is called the Arshan-Gol River.

think whatever demonstration the witness is making should also be made to the bench.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need for him to point out any name. He can read out the name, and he can underline it, if necessary.

MR. BLAMENEY: Unless the prosecution is willing to concede that the difference pointed out by the witness exists, I think I must insist that it be shown to the Tribunal if it is going to be a matter in dispute.

THE PRESIDENT: If you think we will be better informed as a result, let us see that. He said there was a difference in words. Let him point out the words. "hat more can be do?

TR. SHIRNOV: Your Lonor, I intended to ask the same, but a little later on; but previous to the time the map is shown to the bench I would like to ask your direction to determine the names of the places through which the border line passes according to the agreement between Molotov and TOGO.

THE PRESIDENT: One difficulty at a time.

That is another matter entirely. Let us clear up this point about the alleged difference between the maps.

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

EO

19

21

22

24

"ell, "ajor Blakeney, you want the bench to see what the witness pointed out. He will have to come to us, and you had better come with him, you and Colonel Smirnov, to make sure the right spot is pointed out.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings took place at the bench:)

THE WITNESS: In this map (indicating)this branch river is named Khalkhin-Gol River, while in this map (indicating) that branch river is mentioned as Arshan-Gol.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, put the letter "x" alongside the name in each map.

> ("hereupon, the witness complied with the President's request.)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, as far as I can judge, 17 nothing has been gained by bringing the witness to the 18 bench. He has simply put an "x" in each of the maps 19 in the places he has in mind. The names are not in 20 English. Tomorrow morning we may ask this witness to make a more distinct marking on those two maps.

We will adjourn now until half-past nine tonorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, 28 May 1947, at 0930.)

4

6

10

11

12 13

14 15

22